

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
CHARLOTTE DIVISION

## ORDER

On November 6, 2006, this Court denied Plaintiff Spicer's Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* and ordered him to pay the required filing fee within 30 days. (Doc. No. 3). He failed to pay the fee, and accordingly, this Court dismissed his case without prejudice. (Doc. No. 7). Spicer subsequently filed a motion asking this Court to give him another 30 days to pay the fee. (Doc. No. 8).

Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allows a party to seek from the Court an alteration or amendment of a previous judgment to, *inter alia*, “correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice.” United States ex rel. Becker v. Westinghouse Savannah River Co., 305 F.3d 284, 290 (4th Cir. 2002) (citation and quotations omitted). The plaintiff, however, has failed to supplement his request with any argument that the Court’s ruling was in error or that the consequence of its ruling – dismissal without prejudice – was overly harsh. “Mere disagreement does not support a Rule 59(e) motion.” Hutchinson v. Staton, 994 F.2d 1076, 1082 (4th Cir. 1993).

**THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 8) be **DENIED**.

Signed: September 21, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert J. Conrad, Jr.  
Chief United States District Judge

